



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,381	09/01/2000	Sadik Bayrakeri	SEDN/265	7076
56015 7590 07/16/2007 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			EXAMINER BUI, KIEU OANH T	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23, 25, and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Remark

2. Claims 24, 26-27 have been previously cancelled; claims 1-23, 25 and 28 are pending for reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11, 14, 16-23, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludvig et al. (WO 00/05890) in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent 5,861,906).

In regard to claim 1, Ludvig discloses producing a video frame sequence representing an interactive program guide IPG, where the encoding process of the produced video frame is performed within the head end of an information distribution system. Ludvig discloses receiving, from service provider equipment, objects comprising video slice encoded by a service provider, where the search object is for an interactive program guide (Page 4, Line 8 - Page 5, Line 12). Ludvig fails to explicitly disclose, "receiving one or more search criteria via user interaction with said search object", "sending a request for a search along with the one or more search criteria to a

Art Unit: 2623

head end of an information distribution system", "receiving at least one search result from the service provider equipment" or that "the program guide database is searched at the service provider equipment"; however, Bruette teaches an exact same technique as within IPG program guide, the user can send a request and provides user-generated search criteria via user interaction with the search object to the headend or service provider (refer to Dunn, Figs. 1, 5, 9, 12, and col. 2/lines 40-61; col. 3/lines 3-16; col. 5/lines 21-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ludvig's system with Dunn's teaching technique in order to provide the user an interactive control by providing user-generated search criteria for objects/programs to search in the program guide as well as the program guide database is searched at the service provider equipment.

In regard to claim 2, Dunn discloses displaying the search results (Fig. 12/step 234).

In regard to claims 3-4, the claimed limitations of "highlighting a channel object on the displayed IPG page corresponding to one received search result" and "wherein the channel object is highlighted by placing a cursor on the channel object" are disclosed in Ludvig (See Page 18, Lines 13-33).

In regard to claim 5, the claimed method is met as follows: the claimed steps of "receiving an indication that the highlighted channel object has been selected; retrieving one or more streams associated with the selected channel object; and decoding the one or more retrieved streams to recover a selected program" are disclosed in Ludvig (See Page 20, Lines 3-13).

In regard to claim 6, Dunn discloses the user making selections with an input device (col. 7/lines 13-26 for a remote control handset for the user interface).

Art Unit: 2623

In regard to claim 7, Dunn discloses multiple searches and "Receiving an indication to view a next search result" and "displaying an IPG page included therein the next search result" is shown (col. 12/lines 50-col. 13/line 26).

In regard to claim 8, it is noted that the examiner interprets "one or more" to be written in the alternative, such that the limitation may be met by either one or more. Therefore, claim 8 met by that discussed above for claim 2.

In regard to claim 9, Ludvig discloses identifying IPG pages using packet identifiers (PIDs) (See Page 12, Line 32 - Page 13, Line 20).

In regard to claim 10, it is clear that the search engine of Dunn returns and for subsequent display only that which meets the search criteria (Fig. 12/step 234 for displaying only customized search criteria).

In regard to claim 11, Dunn teaches providing search result in a particular order of relevance so as to allow the user to access programs of interest first (Fig. 12/step 236).

Claims 14 and 16 is met by that discussed for claim 1.

In regard to claim 17, Ludvig discloses program guide information source (See Page 7, Lines 13-21).

In regard to claim 18, Dunn teaches the indexing of a database so as to make entries easy to find (col. 9/lines 12-19).

In regard to claim 19, Dunn discloses searching with one or more keywords (col. 7/line 55 to col. 8/line 23).

Claims 20 and 21 are met by those discussed for claims 1 and 4, respectively.

Claims 22 and 23 are met by those discussed for claims 6 and 2, respectively.

Art Unit: 2623

In regard to claim 25, Ludvig discloses the user of bitmaps (See Page 17, Line 27- Page 18, Line 7).

In regard to claim 28, Dunn shows to use remote control for moving cursor position to activate/deactivate an object so as to provide the user with a graphical user interface that is easy to use (Dunn, col. 7/lines 12-27).

5. Claims 12-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludvig et al. in view of Dunn and further in view of Lemmons et al. (US Pat Pub No 2003/0115603).

In regard to claims 12 and 13, the combined teaching discloses a search tool that enables a user to search an electronic program guide. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose the step providing the search result base on show times where show time closest to present time is provided first and the search result having a scheduled show time furthest from the present time is provided last. Lemmons teaches providing the search result base on show times where show time closest to present time is provided first and the search result having a scheduled show time furthest from the present time is provided last so as to allow the user to access programs that will be starting at a time close to the present (Paragraph 0088). Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching of Ludvig and Dunn to provide the search result base on show times of Lemmons where show time closest to present time is provided first and the search result having a scheduled show time furthest from the present time is provided last for the stated advantage.

Art Unit: 2623

In regard to claim 15, the combined teaching discloses a search tool that enables a user to search an electronic program guide. The combined teaching fails to explicitly disclose that the search results are received as out-of-band data from the head end. The Lemmons reference teaches the use of transmitting data from the head end to the set top box on an out-of-band channel so as to provide a continuous feed transmission (Paragraph 0042). Consequently, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teaching with search results that are received as out-of-band data from the head end for the stated advantage.

Conclusion

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to PTO New Central Fax number:

(571) 273-8300, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

*Hand deliveries must be made to Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to “Krista” Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (571) 272-7291. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM, with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, John W. Miller, can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Bui', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kieu-Oanh Bui
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

KB
July 06, 2007